

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
ERIE DIVISION

LARRY ALLEN SLEDGE,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	1:21-CV-00348-RAL
)	
vs.)	RICHARD A. LANZILLO
)	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
COUNSELOR HEATHER MARTIN,)	
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER RYAN)	
TARASOVICH, LT. BEGANICS,)	ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
)	SUMMARY JUDGMENT
)	
Defendants,)	IN RE: ECF NO. 36
)	

Plaintiff Larry Allen Sledge (“Sledge”) has filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 36. The Defendants have filed a response in opposition.¹ ECF No. 39. But Sledge did not file a memorandum in support of his motion, as is required by our Local Rules. *See* LCvR 56(B)(2). Sledge’s motion also fails to comply with LCvR 56(B)(1), which states that a motion for summary judgment must be accompanied by “[a] separately filed concise statement setting forth the facts essential for the Court to decide the motion for summary judgment . . . in separately numbered paragraphs” and an appendix containing all documents referenced in the Concise Statement.

Although due accommodation is given to Sledge’s pro se status, he is still responsible for following basic rules of procedure. *McNeil v. United States*, 508 U.S. 106, 113 (1993). Accordingly, Sledge’s motion for summary judgment is hereby denied, without prejudice.

¹ A motion to dismiss filed by the Defendants is currently pending. *See* ECF No. 22; ECF No. 37 (Defendants’ Notice of Intent to Stand on Previously Submitted Motion to Dismiss). Sledge has filed a memorandum in opposition (ECF Nos. 28, 40) and the matter has been taken under advisement.

So ordered this 29th day of June, 2022.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. Lanzillo", written in a cursive style.

RICHARD A. LANZILLO
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE